

Remarks/Arguments

In the Office Action dated August 21, 2008, it is noted that: claims 1-14 are pending; claims 1-14 stand rejected; and claims 1 and 12 are independent.

Claims

Claims 1 and 12 have been amended herein to substantially include the features of claims 2 and 13 respectively. Claims 2 and 13 have been cancelled. Claim 15 is newly added. Claim 15 is based on the original disclosure, for example, pages 8, lines 15-19. No new matter is entered.

None of the cited references mentions or suggests the features of new claim 15: “a total charge data history is updated based on the temperature data.”

Rejection of Claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tokunaga et al., EP 1079361 (hereinafter “Tokunaga”) and Sundahl et al. US 2003/0071821 (hereinafter Sundahl). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 includes the features of: “a controller coupled to receive data related to the operating conditions of the display pixels from the sensors for determining a brightness change of the pixels caused by the operating conditions, to generate a driving signal for driving the pixels in dependence on the total charge data and the temperature data.” Emphasis added.

Independent claim 12 includes the features of: “generating a driving signal in dependence on the total charge data and the temperature data.”

On page 3 of the final Office Action, it is admitted that Tokunaga fails to suggest the total charge data of a pixel and turns to paragraph 30 of Sundahl.

In reviewing the combination of Tokunaga and Sundahl, neither reference suggests generating a driving signal for driving the pixels in dependence on the total charge data and the temperature data. Generating a driving signal in dependence on both the total charge data and the temperature data is not contemplated by the references.

Tokunaga only suggests that an application voltage to the EL element is determined while referring to a data table which contains relationships between temperatures and application voltages.

Sundahl only suggests that the total charge may be used to determine the voltage correction required to maintain a desired luminance.

The combination of these elements is unique since neither reference suggests generating a driving signal for driving the pixels in dependence on the total charge data and the temperature data. Because the combination of references does not teach or suggest every claimed feature, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1 and 12 is obviated and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 2-11, 13, 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2-5 and 7-11, 13, 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tokunaga, Sundahl in view of Cok et al. (hereinafter “Cok”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

These dependent claims include further distinguishing feature, for example claim 3 includes: “the controller is adapted to derive an acceleration factor from the temperature data and to adjust the driving signal depending on the product of the total charge data and the acceleration factor.” Claim 14 includes similar features.

The combination of Tokunaga, Sundahl and Cok fails to teach or suggest the claimed features. The Office Action points to paragraphs 70 and 71 of Tokunaga as showing the claimed features. However, a review of the combination of references finds that there no suggestion at all concerning the driving signal depending on the product of the total charge data and the acceleration factor.

Furthermore, the table in Tokunaga does not suggest an acceleration factor as claimed by applicant. That is, the relationships between the temperature values and voltages to be applied in Tokunaga does not represent an acceleration factor. Tokunaga describes determining the drive voltage based on the data table. There is no suggestion of an acceleration factor to adjust the driving signal, as claimed by applicant.

Claim 10 includes: “means to sense a relation between a reverse current and a reverse voltage of the pixels for deriving degradation state data for the pixels, and said

controller is adapted to generate said driving signal taking account of said degradation state data.”

The Office Action points to Tokunaga paragraphs 156 and 163 as allegedly showing the features. However, a review of cited sections of Tokunaga finds no suggestion of sensing a relation between a reverse current and a reverse voltage of the pixels for deriving degradation state data for the pixels.

Furthermore, because these dependent claims include the features of claims 1 or 12 and further distinguishing features each dependent claim should likewise be allowed.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tokunaga, Sundahl, Cok and Lee et al (US 2003/0151569).

Claim 6 includes all the features of claims 5 and 1 and further distinguishing features. Lee et al. is apparently cited for showing the additional features recited in claim 6; however, Lee et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Tokunaga, Sundahl and Cok as noted above in the discussion of claim 1.

Accordingly, applicants essentially repeat the above arguments from claim 1 and respectfully submits that claim 6 is allowable by virtue of its dependency, as well as the additional subject matter recited therein and not shown in the combination of references. Furthermore, Cok, col. 4, lines 22-36 discloses: “The actual attributes measured will depend on the technology of the display device, the materials that comprise it and the manufacturing process used to create it. In particular, the charge storage at the pixel site, the impedance across any light emitting pixel, the efficiency and frequency of the light emission, current draw, and voltage drop at particular points in a circuit, are all important attributes of the pixel performance.”

Cok never suggests monitoring current and time and further fails to suggest total charge data. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 5 and 6 are likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Tokunaga, Sundahl, Cok and Lee et al. and should be allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/

By: Brian Myers

Registration No.: 46,947

For: Mike Belk,

Registration No.: 33,357

Mail all correspondence to:

Mike Belk, Registration No. 33,357
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001